

RemarksRegarding independent claim 1:

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by deVos et al. In response, the Applicants have amended claim 1 to better recite what the Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, the Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitations that:

- the light source is modulated;
- location based on a light pattern on the light sensing surface;
- location is based on identification information included within the modulated light source.

Analysis of deVos reveals that deVos determines location based on a received reflection. In particular, a detecting device receives a reflected beam of light and generates an output signal. Location is determined from the angle of the received reflection. Nowhere does deVos teach or otherwise suggest that his light source is modulated, or that location is based on a light pattern on the light sensing surface, or that location is based on identification information included within the modulated light source. Because of this, independent claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding independent claim 16:

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by deVos. In response, the Applicants have amended claim 16 to better recite what the Applicants regard as their invention. Particularly, claim 16 has been amended to include the limitations that:

- light is simultaneously received from a plurality of light sources;
- the light is projected through a pinhole lens to produce a pattern of light on a light sensing surface; and
- location is determined based on the pattern of light on the light sensing surface.

Analysis of deVos reveals that deVos never simultaneously receives light from a plurality of light sources. In fact, deVos only receives light from individual reflections, each being received one at a time. Additionally, deVos fails to teach or otherwise suggest the light being passed through a pinhole lens to produce a pattern on the sensing surface. Finally, deVos fails to teach or otherwise suggest that location is determined based on the pattern of light on the sensing surface. Because of this, independent claim 16 is not anticipated by deVos.

Regarding independent claim 18:

Claim 18 was amended to include all of the limitations originally found in claim 25. Because claim 25 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 18 is now in proper condition for allowance.

Regarding independent claim 32:

Claim 32 was amended to include all of the limitations originally found in claim 36. Because claim 32 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 32 is now in proper condition for allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. As the Applicant has overcome all substantive rejections given by the Examiner the Applicant contends that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's rejections to the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter. Finally, please charge any fees (including extension of time fees) or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502117.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Perkins, ET AL.

by: 

Kenneth A. Haas  
Reg. No. 42,614  
Phone: (847) 576-6937  
FAX: (847) 576-3750